

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-7, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,533,102 (hereinafter Robinson) submitted in view of U.S. Patent 5,568,540 (hereinafter Greco).

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. **Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).*

As argued below, the prior art references simply do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the independent claims of the present application. Specifically, the Examiner cites Greco as teaching the limitation of claim 1 requiring that **said call management computer includes means for identifying a call type for the incoming call**. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Greco '540, Method and Apparatus for Selecting and Playing a Voice Mail Message, describes a **graphical user interface** for the display of voice mail message information (Abstract, Summary). A graphical user interface is not a call management computer. The portions of the specification cited by the Examiner as teaching the limitation in claim 1 (column 4, lines 55-65) describe the third, fourth, and fifth columns in a graphical user interface presenting voice messages available to the user. Nowhere in Greco is a call management computer described with means for identifying a type for the incoming call. Instead, a graphical user interface is described that presents the calls, which are already defined by type, to the user. Where and how the call type is determined is not disclosed, in Greco. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim 1 has been overcome.

Claims 4-7, 17 and 18 all depend from Claim 1, and claim additional limitations upon the call management system. According to the argument presented above for claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 4-7, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are improper because Greco describes a **graphical user interface** for presenting information about

previously-identified calls and fails to teach a **call management computer** with means for identifying a call type for the incoming call.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected Claims 19-24, 27-30, 36, 139, and 157 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Robinson submitted in view of Greco in combination with several other patents. Given that the rejected claims all depend upon claim 1, which includes the limitation of a **call management computer** with means for identifying a call type for the incoming call, and given that each of the rejections depended upon Greco for teaching the limitation, the Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome in the same manner as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 09/08/, 2004



Andre L. Marais

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
(408) 947-8200